



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_20740
Title of the Manuscript:	Kineticsof Powder-Free Laboratory Examination Gloves at 323°C and 408°Cby Thermogravimetric Analysis
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper is poorly written and is riddled with grammatical and typographical errors. Abstract is poorly written and needs attention. Authors have given a whole sentence in the keywords section Introduction needs to be more suitably structured with a logical flow of information. The referencing is poorly managed in that Lines 25-27 which lacks the science has [1,2,3,4,5] references. There are referencing errors e.g. line 37 Fig 1 and written details thereof should be moved to the results section and not be part of the experimental section.. Information given in Line 124-135 should not be part of the results and discussion.</p> <p>The weight % in figure does begin at a 100% authors need to show proper % weight loss scales. Are the details given in Line 113 a claim or is there any experimental proof ? The two sentences in Line 149-150 are contradictory. The sentence in line 158 is confusing and needs clarification. Figure 2 is poorly labelled and poorly presented with labelling errors. Figure 3 is also riddled with spelling errors. Is there a need to present both figs 2 and 3? Line 262 is confusing. Fig 8 a is extremely poorly presented.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Table 4 should not be split. The conclusions needs major revision and rewriting. Fig 10 needs attention. Line 395 is not a conclusion Referencing needs attention	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper needs major revision	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ajay Bissessur
Department, University & Country	University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa